

REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action dated January 15, 2008. In view of the foregoing amendments and following representations, reconsideration is respectfully requested.

By the above amendment, new claims 35-41 are added. Thus, claims 18-26 and 28-41 are currently pending in the present application. Following the previous Office Action, the claims stand as follows: claims 18-25, 28 and 30-34 are rejected over the prior art, and claims 26 and 29 are allowed.

On pages 2-7 of the Office Action, the claims are rejected as follows:

Claims 18-22, 24, 30, 32 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hawrylo (U.S. Patent No. 4,576,326) in view of Kurpiela (U.S. Patent No. 5,579,979);

Claims 23, 25 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hawrylo and Kurpiela and further in view of Powers et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0195297);

Claim 33 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hawrylo (U.S. Patent No. 4,576,326) in view of Kurpiela (U.S. Patent No. 5,579,979); and

Claim 28 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hawrylo (U.S. Patent No. 4,576,326) and further in view of Laub et al. (U.S. Patent No. 3,790,738).

It is submitted that the present invention, as embodied by the present claims, is clearly allowable over the teachings of the applied prior art references for the following reasons.

In the explanation of the rejection, the Examiner takes the position that:

“Figures 1 and 2 of Kurpiela clearly depict a contact surface 5 that has a larger area than component 15. Note in figure 1 how contact surface 5 in certain locations extends all the way to the housing 2.”

However, as previously asserted, the contact surface of nozzle bottom 5 is not larger than the upper surface of the component 15 as clearly shown in Fig. 2 of Kurpiela. Note that the portions that extend all the way to the housing are not contacting surfaces. Thus, the Kurpiela reference does not include any disclosure or suggestion of a collet having a contacting side that is larger than a contacting portion of the semiconductor laser component. Therefore, the limitations of independent claims 18, 30, 33, and 35 (new) are clearly not met by the Kurpiela reference, taken alone or in combination with Hawrylo.

Further, in Kurpiela the edge of the contact surface 5 conforms to the edge of the component 15 at the position where the outlet port 4 is provided. If the collet and semiconductor device are displaced in this type of configuration, warping of the semiconductor device will occur. Further, in Kurpiela, heated air is blown through slot-like openings 4a toward leads 16 to accelerate soldering. Thus, the leads 16 should be positioned right below the outlet port 4. That is, since the leads 16 are provided at a edge of the component 15, the edge portion of the component 15 should be positioned

at a positioned in consideration of the position of the out let port 4. Therefore, the edge portion of the component 15 cannot be positioned inside of the edge portion of the contact surface 5.

Apparently, in recognition of this fact, the Examiner takes the position that "it would have been obvious . . . to employ a collet having a contacting side with an area as large or larger than a contacting portion of said semiconductor laser component in order to insure an even force distribution over the surface of the component being bonded." Since the prior art of record does not disclose or suggest this feature, the Examiner is requested to cite a reference supporting the stated position or provide an affidavit setting forth specific factual statements and explanation to support the position.

New Independent Claim 41

Claim 41 requires, *inter alia*, that "said collet and said table are heated up to the same temperature when said collet and said table are heated and said collet and said table are cooled under a same temperature profile when the semiconductor laser device is cooled."

The prior art of record does not disclose or suggest a method in which the "collet and the table are heated up to same temperature when the collet and the table are heated, and the collet and the table are cooled under the same temperature profile when the semiconductor laser device is cooled." Therefore, it is submitted that claim 41 is allowable.

In view of the above, it is submitted that the present application is now clearly in condition for allowance. The Examiner therefore is requested to pass this case to issue.

In the event that the Examiner has any comments or suggestions of a nature necessary to place this case in condition for allowance, then the Examiner is requested to contact Applicant's undersigned attorney by telephone to promptly resolve any remaining matters.

Respectfully submitted,

Atuhito MOCHIDA et al.

By:



Michael S. Huppert
Registration No. 40,268
Attorney for Applicants

MSH/kjf
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
May 15, 2008